113, 563 Kazak RQ2

[For information on the Kazak in Sinkiang, see 1: Lattimore, AI 1 Sinkiang, pp. 128-132.]

from winter quarters; they prepared the ground, sowed the crops and then departed, leaving the poorer members of the group to keep watch over the planted lands until their return for the harvest.

The difficulty of determining what should be considered the migratory unit has been suggested in the discussion above of the nature of the aul. According to Kargabaiev the Davlet uru and other people living with them, forming together the Karastaq aul, were divided during the period of summer pasturage into groups of five or six related families who set up their kibitkas in one place when they camped and moved together from one part to another of the whole area traditionally utilized by the Davlet uru. He explained that when he had said previously that they only journeyed 9 kilometers to summer pastures he meant it was 9 kilometers from the common winter quarters to the beginning of the upland pastures where they separated into smaller groups.

Such was apparently the condition described by Grodekov[15] in writing, "They migrated as a society of one gens [Russian: rod] but admitted to the aul individuals from other gentes related through the mother's line and also poor people hired as workers. The routes of migration were fixed for each gens which had its designated place for summer and autumn." Then, a few lines later, "They migrate in groups of a greater or less number of kibitkas." The first statement seems to refer to the uru as it may be considered a migratory unit, and the second to its component parts of family groups. A further statement emphasizes this point.[16] "In summer they live more in scattered groups; in winter more compactly. If they lived too closely together in summer there would be an inadequacy of pasture and the cattle would become mixed up."

The small family groups, in theory at least, might camp anywhere convenient for them in the general area occupied by the uru and remain as long as they liked. Grodekov states[17] that the master of each kibitka started out and halted when he wished. The leaders of the uru, the aqsaqal " . . . or, according to some, the rich men, suggest, but do not compel."[18]

This indication of the persuasive power of the rich, along with Grodekov's previously quoted remark concerning the presence in the aul of poor people hired as workers, paves the way to a consideration of the distinctions between rich and poor in connection with the yearly round of economic life.

Such distinctions were very marked. It was primarily the wealthy and middle class herd owners who migrated with their animals, taking along with them a large number of herdsmen and shepherds. These, according to my informants, were of two kinds: first, poor relatives of the cattle owner, members of his own uru, who worked for him without pay and toward whom he stood in a patriarchal relation as their patron and protector; and second, hired workers of another uru who received wages. Rudenko writes:[19]

[15] *Kirgizy i Karakirgizy*, 109–10.
[16] *Idem*, 110.
[17] *Kirgizy i Karakirgizy*, 110.
[18] See also Dingelstedt, *Le Droit coutumier*, 314.
[19] *Ocherk Byta . . . Kazakov*, 20.

kolkhoz. On the other hand, those Kazakhs who have changed from herding to farming live in villages which are no longer kin communities. The background of this differentiation antedates the Revolution, and is an important part of Kazakh developments during the last hundred years.

In the period from 1850 to 1917 the Russians gradually took over the more fertile sections of the steppe in the north, especially along lake shores and river banks, and in mountain piedmont. This left less steppe, and less fertile steppe, for the rapidly increasing Kazakh population. The impoverished Kazakhs were impelled to take up agriculture, which requires less territory per individual than does herding; in regions having sufficient annual rainfall to support cultivation, farming is a more efficient use of the land and hence permits greater density of population. Where the Kazakhs were thus forced to take up agriculture, they tended to break up the kinship units. The agricultural villages are larger than the nomadic, and are composed of broken clans, broken lineages, villages, and families.

Many Kazakh communities survived this impact and managed to maintain their herding pattern, usually in conjunction with a certain minimum amount of farming, which was done in the vicinity of the winter camp by the women and the poor. Communities of this kind comprise the norm to this day; farming among such villages and kolkhozy is largely concerned with raising feed for the livestock. These communities have, as a general rule, gone over bodily into the collective farm system. One such collective farm is the Belbasar Kolkhoz in the Dzhambul region, in the valley of the Chu River. This farm is composed of 116 households; of these 100 are Kazakh, all of the same lineage, the Akhsha lineage of the Dulat clan of the Great Horde. Of the remaining households, 13 are Azerbaijani, two are Russian, and one is a Kazakh who came to this kolkhoz from the Middle Horde in 1942 as a blacksmith. The head of one of the Russian families is a carpenter, the other a kolkhoz leader.[1]

This collective farm in the south appears in striking contrast to those in the north, in the farming zone of the Semipalatinsk region, for example, where Kazakh clan and lineage affiliations are mixed and confused. The Kazakhs of southeast Kazakhstan know their horde and clan affiliations; they are all of the Great Horde, and of one of four clans. Korbe compiled a list of 11 collective farms in this area in which the core population consisted of members of a specific lineage of a specific clan. It thus seems clear that in this part of Kazakhstan the anvil upon which the collective farm pattern was hammered out was the descent group and the kin village. Here, then, is a Kazakh institution which served as a means of accommodation to the Soviet pattern.[2]

The kin village and lineage were the channels through which the Kazakh herdsmen passed into the collective farm life. That the passage was made indicates the force which these institutions have even today.

The traditional function of the nomadic village was to organize the annual movements of the member families as a collective enterprise

[1] Korbe, 1950, p. 71.
[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 71-72.

towards Russia, Turkey, and England. The cultural cohesion created by Islam that connects Chinese Turkestan with Russian Turkestan and other neighboring Muslim countries, and that created by Buddhism that connects Mongolia with Tibet through Chinghai and small areas of Sinkiang, marked the four provinces of Sinkiang, Chinhai, Kansu, and to a small degree, Shensi, as one single area which represents one administrative unit.

The Eastern Turks:

The main pattern of social life of the Eastern Turks is based primarily on "Oasis Agriculture" with its irrigational complex. All agriculture in this area is made possible through the organized use of water. The family organization among the Eastern Turks is therefore an extended one, since a certain level of productivity can only be reached through collective labor (upkeep of irrigational systems and dikes). One reason the Eastern Turks developed the extended family pattern is that the family recieves water in proportion to the amount of labor its members put into the upkeep of irrigational systems and canals; the greater the family, the more water is therefore provided for their land.

The Internal structure of the family system is not based upon clan rules. Eastern Turkic communities are governed by a body of leaders, selected from the community itself whereas the larger governmental districts are headed by Chinese officials or, at present, by Chinese Communists. A secondary aspect of Eastern Turkic social life is formed by trade and handicrafts. Merchants and craftsmen form "guilds" which in turn influence the social life of the community.

Kirghiz and Kazakhs:

Kirghiz and Kazakh society is clan-based. (The definition of the notion of "clan" is explained in the chapter about the Social Structure.) All family relationships are deeply rooted in the clan system. The main pattern of social life among these two tribes is created by their nomadic way of life, whose most essential economic activity is cattle breeding. The transition to a semi-sedentary life is now under way. The Communists insist that the Kirghiz and Kazakhs occupy a permanent winter camp site, since this facilitates better political control over the tribes. The choice of the summer camp site still remains more or less in the hands of the tribes. Kirghiz and Kazakhs are ruled by "bäks," or "manaps" (elders) responsible to the Chinese officials.

The Mongols: general remarks.

Mongol social life is based on nomadic pastoralism. The basic unit is the nuclear family. A group of patrilineally

1: Washington S-4 (no date) 1956 AF13 Northwest China AF13
Sinkiang AI1
Kazak RQ2

S N 563 233 [423] [476]

V. Individualistic and Collectivistic Bents and Traditions

The nomadic society of the Kirghiz, Kazakhs and Mongols shows collectivistic trends insofar as the pastures are always owned collectively and the livestock can be taken care of and protected only cooperatively. In periods of war and uprisings, the livestock had to be protected militarily, which was one reason why the military organization of the nomads, introduced by Chingis Khan, survived up to the twentieth century.

S S 563 181

Here we can say that the nomadic Kirghiz and Kazakh still shows a tremendous martial spirit, especially the Kazakhs who fought the Communists in 1949 and 1950 in a heroic way in spite of the fact that they were outnumbered from the very beginning.

N S 563 181

As a matter of fact, the Mongols show much less martial spirit than neighboring Kirghiz, Kazakh and especially Tibetans, who constantly rise up here and there, becoming a major nuisance for Peking, although they are hopelessly outnumbered by Chinese Communist Troops. Many explorers agree independently that the Mongols, once intrepid, dauntless, unafraid, frightful and terrifying warriors, make now the impression of being inefficient soldiers, timid, downhearted, and discouraged (so Rockhill, Howorth, Tafel, Vladimirtsov, Hedin, Futterer, and Filchner). Russian scholars, above all B. Vladimirtsov in his Le Regime Social Des Mongols, Le feodalisme Nomade, Paris 1948, blame Buddhism for the disappearance of the martial spirit and courage of the Mongols. This opinion is, however, contradicted by the fact that Tibetans, who have been influenced by Buddhism some centuries longer than the Mongols, are well-known as tough and cunning fighters and apparently fearless and daring insurgents.

S N 563 181 771 114

N 563 192

Almost every Tibetan family has at least one son in a monastery. They faithfully pay their tributes to these monasteries where their sons live as novices or monks. The monasteries are the only cultural centers of the nomads. Kumbum might be named as a magnificent example in regard to external architectural beauty as well as internal wealth in respect to its library, printing house, and the spiritual value of its schools and its Lamaistic academies.

S N 563 668 233 [361]

There are many reasons to believe that the Communist regime is determined to abolish nomadism and to make the nomads sedentary or at least semi-sedentary. The first step was the erection of permanent winter sites. The attitude of the nomads toward the regime seems to be ambivalent. The erection of veterinary stations for the livestock and the extension of additional irrigated pastures certainly are measures approved by the nomads but on the other hand the threatening

619 kinsman. Thus, for example, a clan of the Great Horde, the Kereit, separated from the Kazakh federation and joined an Uzbek group which bore the name of Kereit. A small portion later returned to the Kazakhs, but this time established itself in the Little Horde. Those who made the move to join the Little Horde were thereupon given a fictive genealogy tracing descent from the eponymous founder of the Karakot clan in the Little Horde.[47]

619 563 Movement in a contrary sense, that of Turkic non-Kazakhs into the Kazakh society, also is recorded, and embodies the identical features. Thus a certain group of the Karakirgiz joined the Atygai clan of the Middle Horde, gradually merged with it, and became a lineage of that clan. In order to obtain the genealogical right to membership in that clan, the newcomers now traced their ancestry back to one of the twelve sons of a certain Daut, who was the clan-founder of the Atygai.[48] The author of this record was a native Kazakh, in the Russian service in the 19th century, and set down his traditions with care. Noteworthy is the fact that the concept of the genealogical right to membership is his formulation, and no one else's.

619 The clans had either eponymous founder-names, or

---

[47] Ibid., 291.

[48] Idem.

[AHAI Kazakhs]

613 have been the statement, for example, of Cham, M. Chamov's father. Chamov himself would have to marry outside his ata, those who shared with him a common ancestor in the ascending paternal line in the person of Sary, the son of Sargaldak, the sŭök founder; Sary was the founder of the ata in question, he being in the seventh ascending generation from Chamov. However, it would be dangerous to infer a universal rule from these data, for we have seen that the exogamic principle has been subject to considerable variation throughout the steppe, and among the Kazakhs as well.

613 177.61 ●563 A number of marks of acculturation are to be observed in the genealogy and commentaries on it.[1] First of all, the concept of the sŭök has changed: no longer is there a distinction between ak sŭök and kara sŭök;[2] whatever social distinction there was, was made between rich and poor Kazakhs, on the basis of wealth and not of birth; Rudenko's comment that family and social life among the Kazakhs was very archaic and conservative in form[264] to the contrary notwithstanding. Again, a Russian system of patronymics was instituted, whereby the Kazakh Chamov was called thus because his father bore the name Cham, thus establishing a system of family names which had never existed before. A follow-up ethnography would probably show a considerable rigidifica-

---

[264] Rudenko, op. cit., 66.

1 [Cf. cat. 116, AHI Mongolia, p. 527 ff. -- Analyst]

2 [i.e. nobles and commoners. Cf. cat. 116, AHI Mongolia, pp. 500-501 -- Analyst]